M-15532-3C US 10/813,387

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration as follows:

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 2 6 2007

## The 35 USC 112, 1st ¶ rejection of claims 1-14

Applicants respectfully note that the claim 1 elements of "modeling the correlation product" and "compensating the modeled correlation product" are plainly supported by the discussion in the specification with regard to Figures 22 and 23. For example, on page 86 lines 18-29, the Applicants note that the modeling of the correlation products shown in Figure 23 "may then be subtracted from the direct path correlation, or otherwise compensated for, in order to more accurately track the direct path." The same discussion supports claim 7. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended, however, to reflect the antecedent basis for "correlation products" rather than "correlation product."

## The 35 USC 112, 2nd Trejection of claims 1-14

Applicants respectfully note some confusion with this rejection and interpret it as a demand for an operative connection between claim elements. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no statutory requirement that claim elements have an explicit operative connection. In that regard, MPEP 2173.04 notes that claims breadth is not to be equated with indefiniteness. Moreover, Applicants have not taught that an unclaimed relationship between the claim elements is critical to their invention (see, e.g., MPEP 2164.08(c)). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that their pending claims are definite under 35 USC 112.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned at (949) 752-7040 is welcomed and encouraged.

Certificate of Facsimile Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark

Office on the date shown below.

Saundra L. Carr

Date of Signature:

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan W. Hallman

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 32,622

Customer No. 32,605